

### REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action dated March 28, 2008. Applicants have amended the claims to more completely recite the novel features of the invention within the single independent claim. No new matter has been added, and the amendments place the claims in better condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the claims. The discussion/arguments provided below reference the claims in their amended form.

Applicants are not conceding in this application that those previously-presented claims (Amendment A), are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. The present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating prosecution of the now presented claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the original and previously presented claims and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

At paragraph 4 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11-14, 18-19, 21-24 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cohen* (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,315) in view of *The Open Group* (System Management: Event Management Service). At paragraph 5 of the present Office Action, Claims 5, 15 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cohen* in view of *The Open Group* and further in view of *Bracho et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,021,443). At paragraph 6 of the present Office Action, Claims 6-7, 16-17 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cohen* in view of *The Open Group* and further in view of *Bracho* and *Evans et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,191,180). At paragraph 7 of the present Office Action, Claims 10, 20 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cohen* in view of *The Open Group* and further in view of *Feridun et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,139).

First, Applicants hereby incorporate by reference the arguments proffered in Amendment B, particularly where the previous claim rejections overlap with the current rejections. Second, Applicants have combined subject matter from several of the above rejected dependent claims (now canceled) into the single remaining independent claim. Applicants therefore present the arguments below with reference to the claim features presented within the independent claim.

AUS920030840US1

-5-

Third, the combinations of references fail to suggest to one of ordinary level of skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention, many of the features recited by Applicants' Claim 1. For example, while the combinations provide some discussion of publication data and a publish and subscribe environment, the combinations are devoid of any suggestion of the claim features related to queuing of publication objects that are arranged/scheduled within the queue based on an assigned priority relative to other objects within the queue. Further, the combinations fail to suggest to one skilled in the art the claim features related to expiration of publication objects triggering a publication of a more current object and discarding the queued object.

From the above arguments as well as in the arguments presented in Amendment B, it is clear that the combinations of references do not suggest several of the features of Applicants' claimed invention. Further, one of ordinary skilled in the pertinent art would not find Applicants' claimed invention, as presented within independent Claim 1, unpatentable over the combinations of references. The above claims are therefore also allowable over the combinations.

#### **Rebuttal of Response to Arguments**

At paragraph 8 of the Office Action, Examiner provides his response to Applicants' arguments, which arguments were provided in Amendment B. Applicants reiterate that Applicants' arguments regarding the failure of any particular single reference to teach or suggest a particular claim feature extend to the combination of references. Applicants' arguments are intended to and should be read to traverse the rejections based on the combinations of references.

In presenting the 103 rejections, Examiner relies on the combinations of references to support the overall rejection; However, Examiner relies on specific one(s) of the references to support the respective rejection of the individual features of Applicants' claim elements. Thus, by attacking the particular reference as not suggesting the claim feature that Examiner presents the reference to reject, Applicants are not ignoring the other references or the combination of references. Rather, Applicants attack only the single reference that is specifically cited to support the rejection of the particular feature of Applicants' claim, with the expectation that Examiner, having proffered the single reference to reject that particular feature of the claims, would understand that argument to apply to the combinations as well.

AUS920030840US1


-6-

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by amending the claims to more completely recite the novel features within the single independent claim. Applicants have also explained why Applicants' claims are not obvious in light of the combinations of references provided. The amendments and arguments overcome the §103 rejections, and Applicants, respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicants further respectfully request the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney of record at 512.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Eustace P. Isidore  
Reg. No. 56,104  
Dillon & Yudell LLP  
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway  
Suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)